DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 207 323 FL 012 246

AUTHOR Carty, Maria A.
TITLE Strategies Used by Native Speakers in Native-Non-Native Conversations.
PUB DATE Sep 80
NOTE 36p.; M.A. Thesis, Northeastern University.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Techniques; Context Clues; Cultural Influences; *Discourse Analysis; Educational Strategies; *English (Second Language); Error Patterns; Language Proficiency; Language Styles; Language Usage; Morphology (Languages); *Native Speakers; Non English Speaking; Nonverbal Communication; *Second Language Learning; Semantics; Sociolinguistics; Speech Skills; Syntax; Teaching Methods; Translation

ABSTRACT

Discourse analysis has provided a methodology for the study of conversational interactions between language learner and native speaker. This study examines the verbal and nonverbal strategies that native speakers use when communicating with second language learners in natural, non-academic, "survival type" settings. The areas discussed include: (1) what strategies are used, (2) which are the most common, and (3) which are the most effective. Communicative interactions of native and non-native English speakers were observed and recorded in spontaneous naturally-occurring and non-teaching environments. Results indicate that native speakers utilized a wide range of strategies whenever communicative breakdowns occurred. These strategies fell into three categories--syntactic, non-verbal, and translation--and functioned to establish discourse, verify discourse, and to correct ungrammatical or mispronounced speech. "Foreigner talk" was rarely used in the interactions and translation was typically used only when other attempts at communication had failed. Nonverbal strategies such as gestures and the use of writing and drawing proved beneficial for reinforcing verbalizations when establishing or verifying discourse. Comparisons are made between classroom instruction/correction of non-native speakers and natural setting interaction between native and non-native speakers. (JK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

STRATEGIES USED BY NATIVE SPEAKERS IN NATIVE-NON-NATIVE CONVERSATIONS

M. Carty

ED207323

I. Introduction

In the literature of second language acquisition emphasis has, justifiably, been on the learner. However, with the advent of discourse analysis as a methodology for the study of second language acquisition, the need to study the conversational interactions that take place between the language learner and the native speaker of the target language has emerged. Interest in the conversational input of the native speaker has prompted a number of researchers to investigate related areas such as 'foreigner talk' (Ferguson, 1971, 1975), (Henzl, 1973), (Freed, 1978); teacher (native speaker) corrective strategies in the classroom (Krashen, Seliger, 1975), (Chaudron, 1977) and corrections by native speakers in native-non-native conversations (Gaskill, 1977).

By and large, the studies listed above were undertaken in relatively artificial environments; in all cases the native subjects were cognizant of their own participation in some sort of research effort. In addition, the vast majority were either college eduated, worked in university settings, traveled widely or had taught a foreign language some time in their lives.

It is reasonable to assume that studies which restrict either the contextual and/or the social make-up of the subjects would necessarily produce results which might differ from studies done in naturally-occuring environments.

Research which specifically examines the contribution of the native speaker to the process of second language learning in an everyday, non-artificial setting is almost non-existent, to my knowledge. Thus, the present study is undertaken with the objective of examining the verbal, as well as the non-verbal, strategies that native speakers use when communicating with second-language learners in a natural, non-academic, 'survival type' setting. Three fundamental questions are posed; (1) What, if any, strategies are used? (2) Which are the most common? (3) Which seem to be the most effective?

Fanselow, in a report on the treatment of oral errors, first justified such research when he suggested that "...observation of language learning outside our classrooms in everyday give-and-take between people trying to learn another language and those who speak the target language, may provide helpful insights.. "[1] into the treatment of oral errors in second language learners.

From the data of this study a typology of strategies used by the native speaker will be developed: it is hoped that the results might provide insights into error correction in the classrcom, 'foreigner talk' and pedagogical methodology used in teaching English as a second language.

Research in the field of conversational analysis has produced some significant results with regard to speech adjustments that are made by the native speaker when communicating with speakers whose English proficiency is limited.

Ferguson coined the term 'foreigner talk' for a type of speech adjustment he discovered native speakers make when attempting to communicate with someone who has a very limited grasp of English. He defines 'foreigner

FL 013 246

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this docu

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Maria Carty

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES

Jackendoff, Ray. Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1972.

Jacobs, Roderick, and Rosenbaum, Peter. English Transformational Grammar. Waltham: Blaisdell Publishing, 1968.

Lakoff, Robin. "A Syntactic Argument for Negative Transportation." In Papers from the Fifth Regional Meeting, pp. 140-147. Edited by Binnick, Davidson, Green, and Morgan. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 1969.

Lasnik, Howard, and Fiengo, Robert. "Complement Object Deletion." Linguistic Inquiry 5 (1974): 535-571.

McCawley, James. Everything That Linguists Have Always Wanted to Know About Logic (But Were Ashamed To Ask). Chicago: University of Chicago, forthcoming.

McCawley, Noriko Akatsuka. "Epistemology and Japanese Syntax: Complementizer Choice.", 1978. (Typewritten.)

Sag, Ivan. "A Logical Theory of Verb Phrase Deletion." In Papers from the Twelfth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, pp. 533-546. Edited by Mufwene, Walker and Steever. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 1976.

Thomason, Richard, ed. Formal Philosophy: Selected Papers of Richard Montague. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.

Thompson, Sandra. "The Deep Structure of Relative Clauses." In Studies in Linguistic Semantics, pp. 78-95. Edited by Fillmore, and Langedoen. New York: Holt, 1971.

2A

talk' as "A register of simplified speech...which is used by speakers of a language to outsiders who are felt to have very limited command of the language or no knowledge of it at all."[2] These adjustments exhibit features (Ferguson, 1975) which tend to simplify the grammar by such phenomena as elmination of articles, inflections, auxiliaries or contractions; limited use of verbs and prepositions, and replacement of all negative constructions by a "no" preceeding the item negated such as (No understand?); limited and simplified vocabularies, short sentences and clearly articulated speech.

The results of subsequent studies tend to support Ferguson's initial findings. In a study by Henzl where she observed the language that native speakers of Czech used with American students, she discoved that, though the mechanism for speech adjustments differed from those reported by Ferguson, "...the data demonstrate that there was a tendency to lower inflexional complexity of nominal and verbal categories...Use of the past tense was intentionally avoided by most speakers,"[3] and the "...use of basic vocabulary"[4] was common.

In an exhausitve study on 'foreigner talk', Freed discovered similar adjustments in conversations involving native and non-native speakers of English. Although Freed found that speech between native speakers and foreigners displayed many of the characteristics reported by Ferguson, her study describes yet another variety of 'foreigner talk': "Speech addressed to foreigner listeners is clearly articulated...it is well-formed from the point of view of grammaticality...is spoken slowly, punctuated with many pauses..."[5] and utterances are "...typically short..."[6] with a high proportion of fragments of various types. In short, from her characterization, 'foreigner talk' is an all inclusive term applied to any speech that native speakers address to foreign speakers with limited linguistic abilities. She says "Foreigner Talk is essentially plain ordinary English. There are some (rare) charcteristics of Foreigner Talk that aren't ordinary facts about English usage (the insertion of the subject "you" in imperatives for example) but, by and large, English Foreigner Talk is basically like normal English."[7]

It is important to note that, for the purpose of this study, 'foreigner talk' designates a type of speech adjustment which features those "rare" structurally or semantically anomalous characteristics alluded to by Freed.

Another area upon which this investigation will focus is the corrective strategies of the native speakers. The data compiled in a give-and-take everyday situation will provide some insights into error-correction in the classroom. Krashen and Seliger note that "In all forms of formal instruction, the student is made aware, at least some of the time, when he or she has made an error and this feature value is probably universal."[8] Therefore, the aim of this study will also be to study what kind, if any, corrective feed-back native speaker informants provide the learner. Does the native speaker signal that the learner has produced an error? and what strategies does the native speaker use when making corrections? Does the native speaker correct most phonological, lexical and syntactic errors as Krashen suggests teachers do in the classroom, or does the native correct only for intelligibility?

The results might yield some insights into the questions posed by Krashen and Seliger: Should the teacher in the classroom "...correct <u>all</u> errors or...should [he] concentrate on just those that allow the learner to adjust rules that are currently evolving in his brain?"[9] Perhaps the

data will reveal what some have suggested, that the approach to treating errors in the classroom should be the same as that found in communication breakdowns in any conversation. In her article on a natural (non-academic) approach to second language learning, Tracy Terrell, expresses this sentiment. "In normal second language acquisition the speech of a learner is almost never corrected."[10] Whether or not Terrell's statement is valid depends on her definition of the term 'correction'.

Although a number of definitions are possible, the most common conception is the one described by Chaudron: Correction is "...any reaction of the teacher which clearly transforms, disapprovingly refers to, or demands improvement of the learner's utterance."[11]

An alternative to Chaudron's definition of the term is the one found in Gaskill's study on native-non-native speaker conversations. Gaskill's conceptualization is derived from the work done by Schegloff and others (1977) on native-native conversational interactions. Gaskill found that "other-corrections", (i.e., native speakers') paralleled those described by Schegloff. "Other-corrections were frequently modulated to display uncertainty; that is, they were done as questions such that the correction was proferred for acceptance or rejection rather than asserted."[12]

Thus, in the present study, the term 'correction' includes both the traditional righting of incorrect linguistic material as well as any verbal signals by the native speaker which display uncertainty or rejection of the non-native speaker's utterance.

In summation, it has been noted that newfound interest in the input of the native speaker into the process of second language learning has resulted in a number of studies which investigate pertinent concepts such as 'foreigner talk', teacher corrective strategies in the classroom, and corrections by native speakers in native-non-native conversation. In addition, the introduction also described the aim of the present study which is to examine the verbal as well as the non-verbal strategies found in native-non-native conversational interactions. On the basis of the data, a typology of strategies used by the native speakers will be developed. Again, three questions will be emphasized: (1) What, if any, strategies are used? (2) Which are the most common? (3) Which seem to be the most effective?

II. Method

The study consisted of collecting and analyzing a body of data. Communicative interactions between the native speaker (NS) and the non-native language user (NNS) were observed and recorded (via shorthand) in spontaneous, naturally-occurring and non-teaching environments, e.g., at the airport, the Immigration Office, the Social Security office, in restaurants, stores and the public transportation system.

The number of natives observed and recorded in communicative interactions totaled 26, 14 of whom were women and 12 were men. The native subjects included both black and white Americans; all are employed at one of the various locations above and all work with the public. In terms of linguistic ability, the NNSs varied from strictly mono-lingual to high-intermediate level of ability; the NNSs came from a variety of ethnic backgrounds.

The subjects were observed three hours at each session. At the Social Security office, the Immigration Office and in the public transportation

system (in ethnic neighborhoods) there were a total of three sessions each; at the airport, stores and restaurants; there were a total of two sessions each. More hours were spent at the first three locations because of the availability of greater numbers of NNSs.

In instances where the investigator had to obtain the supervisor's permission to observe, the NSs were told that the investigator was doing research on non-native language input. This precaution was taken in order to eliminate self-consciousness on the part of the NSs and thereby avoid any possible biassing effect on the data.

In all instances the investigator was not permitted to tape record the conversations. However, except at the Social Security office where there are legal restrictions, the investigator received permission to sit behind the counters along side the NSs being observed. The close proximity permitted more accurate listening and recording of both the NS's and NNS's speech.

Since no tape recordings were permitted, phenomena such as stress, intonation and rhythm were difficult to record, and as a result were not incorporated into the data unless it was clear that it was a strategy being used. Also, since no statistical evaluative instruments were used, the interpretation of the data will be based on inferential observations derived from the dictation transcribed. It must further be mentioned that whenever phonetic transcription was necessary, the I.P.A. notional system was utilized.

Additionally, the environment under which the NSs were observed placed some limitations on the conversational content and variety of the interlocutors. More importantly, however, one must also take into consideration the nature of the work situation. Working with the public can be frustrating and extremely demanding, which inevitably leads to attitudinal problems with regard to all people, but in part cular to foreigners who have obvious linguistic limitations and cultu al differences.

Once the data were collected, analysis of the material was made in order to establish a typology of strategies which seemed to be employed by the NSs.

III. Analysis

The data were analyzed and divided into four main descriptive categories: (1) establishing discourse (2) verificiation of discourse (3) corrective acts and (4) extralinguistic material. Under each category, there were sub-headings which innumerate and describe the various strategies employed by the NSs. (See Appendix, page 54).

I. Establishing Discourse

In establishing discourse with NNSs, the NS had available a number of possible strategies. He either attempted to communicate with the NNS as he would a NS; i.e., using grammatically correct English sentences, he employed what has been termed 'foreigner talk', or he resorted to translation, if possible.

A. Syntactic Organization

In most instances, the NS approached the NNS as he would a native using grammatically correct sentences, as opposed to structurally or semantically

anomalous ones. A number of syntactic strategies were used to establish the topic of conversation: various kinds of repetitions, paraphrasing and rephrasing were utilized.

1. Repetition of various kinds was the most frequently used strategy: it served either to establish or clarify the topic of conversation. Although the typologies described in Chaudron's work will not be used here, the data nonetheless confirms his findings that, indeed, there are various kinds of repetitions.

a. The data shows that the NS used a great deal of exact word-by-word repetition: there are instances of self-repetitions as well as repetition of NNS's utterances. Although exact word-by-word repetition of utterances such as

NS. Where's your husband?
NNS. (no response)
NS. Where's your husband?
NNS. (no response)

or

NS. Did you get new jeans?
NNS. (no response)
NS. Did you get new jeans?
NNS. (no response)

was found, other types of repetition were much more common. For example, a kind of repetition found which is related to the word-by-word exact repetition is the kind where the NS repeats his own utterance but places emphasis on a semantically salient item, or replaces an item with another synonym. This is done because word-by-word repetition fails to convey the meaning of the NNS. The NS replaces a salient semantic word with another lexical item, with the hope that a synonym will trigger comprehension on the part of the NNS.

NS. How did she arrive?
NNS. (no response)
NS. How did she <u>arrive</u>?
NNS Hmmm
NS. How did she come?
NNS (no response)

or

NS. I need my fish.
NNS. (no response)
NS. I need <u>that</u> fish.

b. As is the case in rephrasing, (discussed below) in repetitions, extensive use of contrasts is found. In repetitions with contrasts, the NS repeats the utterance word by word but adds a contrasting effect by supplying antonyms as a way of triggering comprehension. The NS repeats either his own utterance on NNS's but adds some sort of lexical contrast.

NS. How did she come?
NNS. What?
NS. How did she come? As a resident or a visitor?

or

NNS. I ūan make test.
NS. You want to take a test? Do you want to drive today or just the permit?

C. Another type of repetition evidenced in the data is repetition of NNS's utterance in either a WH-question or a Yes/No question format. Where the NS repeats the NNS's utterance in a WH-question, the WH-particle remains at the end of the sentence. Sentences such as

NNS. A change for his visa.
NS. A change for what?

or

NNS. I want Ūrron.
NS. You want what?
NNS. Ūron.
NS. Huron. Oh, you want Huron?
NNS. Yes.

confirm what Freed found in her study of 'foreigner talk' that "A noticeable number of WH-questions were formed by keeping the WH particle at the end of the sentence."[13]

There is yet another kind of repetition involving inversion of the NNS's utterance into a question. The NS repeats the NNS's utterance in a Yes/No question format; however, it must be mentioned that at times the NS may replace an incorrectly formed lexical or syntactic item with a corrected form.

NNS. I want to refuse the appointment.
NS. You want to change the appointment?
NNS. Yes.

or

NNS. I need naturalization papers.
NS. You need a naturalization application?
NNS. Yes, please.

or

NNS. I no speak English.
NS. You don't speak English?

d. A fourth type of repetition frequently found is repetition with reduction in syntax, i.e., the NS reduces the syntax of the utterance to essential semantic features by repeating only a segment of the sentence. Presumably this permits the NNS to concentrate on what the NS thinks is the important item in the content of the conversation. The conversational interactions that follow are good examples of repetition with reduction:

NS. Give me 16 doubles.
NNS. (no response)
NS. Do you hear?
NNS. (no response)
NS. 16 doubles.
NNS. O.K.

or

NS. Give me cod fish.
NNS. What?
NS. Cod fish...three.
NNS. (no response)
NS. Do you understand? Three fish.

or

NS. Listen for you name.
NS. Your name.

e. There is yet a fifth type of repetition, which though infrequent, appears in the material as well. Repetition with expansion is where the NS adds more linguistic material to the original utterance to make it more complete. Perhaps this strategy of adding extra linguistic material to the original sentence provides the interlocutors additional information which helps them process the meaning of the sentence more accurately.

NS. Where are you going?
NNS. (says something unintelligible)
NS. Where are you going to?
NNS. (no response)

or

NS. Do you want to know how much you get back?
NNS. (no response)
NS. Next May. Next May you get the full amount.
NNS. (still no response)
NS. Next year, 1979, you get the full amount.

or

NS. When did you file?
NNS. Nine May.
NS. May? In May?
NNS. Yes.

or

NNS. I sent to you before.
NS. Oh, you mailed it?
NNS. What?
NS. You mailed it first. Right?
NNS. Yes.

2. Following repetitions, paraphrasing is the next most widely used strategy in syntactic organization. In paraphrasing, the NS conveys the original meaning of the utterance by rearranging the syntactical format or supplying synonymous words or phrases of the original utterance.

From the following examples, it is evident that paraphrasing is a relatively effective and a frequently used strategy by the NSs. Although the NNS may not understand the original utterance, the same meaning can be conveyed by rearranging the syntax or by providing alternate words which may facilitate comprehension. In the following example the NS replaces the phrase next month with the word January with the hope that the NNS would understand that particular lexical item.

NS. Next month do you want the checks to go to California?
NNS. (no response)
NS. In January, do you want me to send the checks to California?
NNS. Yes.

As it turned out, the NNS did know the word January and he must have made a contextual connection between January, checks, and California because his reply was "Yes" which was the correct contextual response.

In the next example, the NS must have assumed that the NNS did not understand the word duplicate, so it became necessary for the NS to paraphrase that piece of vocabulary by first saying both of them and later two copies.

NS. You have to do it in duplicate.
NNS. What you say?
NS. You must submit both of them, two copies.
NNS. Two copies, yes.

In yet another example, the NNS was having a difficult time understanding the entire utterance; therefore, the NS paraphrased the original sentence in a number of possible ways.

NS. Your husband isn't getting checks from us.
NNS. (looks perplexed)
NS. He doesn't get checks from us.
NNS. (looks perplexed)
NS. He does not get checks from us.
NNS. (still no response)
NS. I can tell you he doesn't get them.
NNS. (says something unintelligible)
NS. He's not getting them.
NNS. Yes, I understand.

The NS first utilizes the progressive then switches to the simple present with a contracted auxiliary. Finding that the NNS still does not understand, she uses the non-contracted form. Finally, she replaces the pronoun checks with the object pronoun them and returns to the progressive. The NS obviously felt that if she paraphrased the utterance she might succeed in getting the meaning across, which she eventually did.

In the fourth example of paraphrasing, again, the NS paraphrases the original utterance, but this time to no avail. She ended up guessing the height of the NNS.

NS. How tall are you?
NNS. (no response)
NS. How tall?
NNS. (no response)
NS. How many inches?
NNS. (still no response)
NS. How many feet are you?
(guesses the height of the NNS)

Countless other examples of paraphrasing could be cited. It suffices to say, however, that this particular strategy either alone, or in conjunction with other strategies, appears to be used frequently and seemingly with great efficacy.

3. Another syntactic strategy used often is what this investigator has termed rephrasing, whereby the NS builds up a common pool of semantically-contextually related information to establish the topic of conversation. This strategy differs from paraphrasing: In paraphrasing the NS simply rearranges the syntax or provides synonymous words or phrases to convey the meaning of the original utterance. In rephrasing the NS says anything that is semantically or contextually related (though not necessarily conveying the original meaning) that might trigger some response from the NNS. When rephrasing, the NS might use antonyms, define words for the NNS or might add extra lexical or syntactic material which may not necessarily relate to the original meaning.

The following conversational interactions are excellent examples of rephrasing where antonyms and extra lexical material are used.

NNS. He is my husband.
NS. Are you a citizen?
NNS. (says something unintelligible)
NS. How did he enter?
NNS. (no response)
NS. Legally or illegally?
NNS. (still no response)
NS. Is he a resident or visitor?

or

NS. What's the purpose of your trip?
NNS. (no response)
NS. Are you visiting?
NNS. (no response)
NS. You're just a tourist?
NNS. (no response)
NS. How long will the visit be?
NNS. (still no response)
NS. What's the purpose of your trip?
NNS. (no response)
NS. (guesses that the NNS is a tourist)

In the first example, the NS wanted to establish the residency status of

the NNS's husband. By asking her if she is a citizen the NS can contextually determine the man's status. But since the NNS did not understand the NS's questions, the NS resorted to semantically related phrases that might permit her to deduce the answer to the question. The NS, therefore, resorted to the phrase "How did he enter?" and that failing, she used antonyms which might trigger comprehension: legally-illegally, resident-visitor. In the second example, in addition to antonyms, the NS also makes use of extra lexical material to build up a pool of information which might render the topic intelligible to the NNS.

Sentences in which the NS rephrases the original utterance by defining what is meant are also common.

NS. I need two identifications.
NNS. (looks perplexed)
NS. I need some I.D.'s.
NNS. What?
NS. I.D....something with your name on it. or
NNS. I no...
NS. A Social Security card, a Green card, that kind of thing.
NNS. Oh, Green card? Yes. (provides his Green Card)

NS. Do you have a Job Certification?
NNS. (no response)
NS. Who's filing a petition?
NNS. What you mean?
NS. Unless you're a professional you need a petitioner.
NNS. (no response)
NS. Who's going to employ you?
NNS. (provides a piece of paper with someone's name on it)

In the foregoing examples, we find rephrasing employing definitions: As the NNS was unable to understand the phrase 'Job Certification', the NS rephrases it for him by telling him that "Unless you're a professional you need a petitioner." That also failing, the NS defines "Job Certification" by asking "Who's going to employ you?" In the conversation where the NS is asking for an I.D., the NS tells the NNS "I.D....something with your name on it."

The first conversation, where the NS is asking for the NNS's I.D., is very interesting from the standpoint that although the NNS did not understand the original sentence nor that which the NS rephrased, it was not until the NS asked for something that the NNS recognized such as 'Green card' that the NNS responded. From the expression on the NNS's face and from his immediate reaction, it was clear that of the entire conversational interaction, the NNS understood only one phrase 'Green card'. From this tiny bit of information, the NS was able to obtain all the information he needed because the NNS supplied not only his 'Green card' but the contents of his wallet as well. It is evident that the NS built up such a large pool of semantically and contextually related information that he was finally able to render the topic of conversation intelligible to the NNS.

And finally, in the next example, the NNS also picked out only one lexical item Spanish which permitted her to understand what was being said:

NNS. I no speak English.
NS. What do you speak?
NNS. (no response)
NS. What do you speak?
NNS. (no response)
NS. What language do you speak?
NNS. (no response)
NS. Do you speak Spanish?
NNS. Yes.

Thus, in the organization of the syntax, a number of strategies were found: various kinds of repetition, (exact word-by-word, word-by-word repetition with contrast, repetition in question formats, repetition with reduction and repetition with expansion); paraphrasing and rephrasing.

4. When establishing discourse with the NNS, the NS seldom simplified the grammar of the utterances to the point of 'foreigner talk'. The NS employed the same kind of grammatically correct speech as was used in contextually similar native-native conversations. It is interesting to note that the use of 'foreigner talk' was restricted to one native subject only. This particular NS volunteered that she altered her speech as she did because it promotes "good will" and facilitates intelligibility. Her empathy toward foreigners stems from the fact that her parents are from Poland.

It must be emphasized, again, that for the purpose of this study 'foreigner talk' refers to utterances which are considered syntactically or semantically anomalous, as described on page four of the Introduction. Evelyn Hatch's example of 'foreigner talk' which she observed while visiting adult E.S.L. classes illustrates this phenomenon clearly.

> "(Teacher talking about individual interviews) Not other student listen. I no want. Necessary <u>you</u> speak. Maybe I say, 'What is your name?...'"[14]

Although Hatch states that "...on the basis of visiting adult schools, simplification to the point of 'foreigner talk' is a much more prevalent phenomenon..."[15] than she originally believed, it is interesting to note that as already mentioned, of a total of twenty-six native subjects, only <u>one</u> used what could be considered 'foreigner talk' when speaking with NNSs. The following examples serve to illustrate this phenomenon in the present study.

(Speech addressed to two men carrying Polish Passports as they approach the counter)

NS. Polish test? (For "Do you want to take the test in Polish?")
NNS. (no response)
NS. Never drive before?
NNS. (no response)
NS. Never drive here?

<u>or</u>

NS. Birthdate?
NNS. (no response)
NS. You got your <u>book</u>... <u>born</u>? (For Birth Certificate)
NNS. Ah...(shows his passport)

<u>or</u>

NS. Is this your first time?
NNS. (no response)
NS. Never...before?. Drive? ...Here?
NNS. (still no response)
NS. But in Poland you drive? ...But not here?
NNS. (no response)

<u>or</u>

NS. May I help you? (Looks at man who appears terribly distraught. She had previously filled out his drivers' test application form.)
NS. No make? (For "Did you pass the test?")
NNS. No.

By an overwhelming majority, the results clearly demonstrate that NSs show a preference for approaching the NNSs as if they were native speakers

of English in that the NS rarely simplified the language with syntactically anomalous utterances. Unlike the few examples of 'foreigner talk' described above, there was an extensive use of contractions such as "You weren't supposed to work," "You're just going to take a written test?" "What's his first name?" "Where's your permit?" or "Sir, I can't understand you." In addition to the lack of grammatical simplification, the choice of the lexicon was not made on the basis of difficulty. The data is filled with relatively difficult vocabulary items such as duplicate, arrive, entire, petitioner, expire, extend, submit, as well as expressions such as permanent residency, on what basis, backed up, regarding what? or itemized form.

The data of the present study does not support Henzl's findings that there is a tendency for the NS to lower inflexional complexity of nominal and verbal categories to such an extent that among other adjustments the "...use of the past tense was...avoided by most speakers..."[16] Throughout the data one finds extensive use of the perfective tenses, the progressive as well as the modals: "Are you going to drive now?" "I'm sorry, I can't give her a Social Security card because her time has expired" "Unless she's disabled she can't receive compensation" "Did you send in a form like this one?" or "Who is it that you need the Social Security number for?"

The discrepancy between the results of the present study and those of Henzl's most likely is due to the type of subjects (both native and non-natives) observed as well as to the setting under which the observations were made. Though the eight native subjects in Henzl's study came from different academic backgrounds, all had been exposed to foreign langauge instruction during their education. More importantly, however, is the setting under which the conversational interactions took place. The fact that the NSs addressed the NNSs in a formal, classroom environment necessarily placed constraints upon the kinds of conversational adjustments made by the NSs. Henzl herself admits that "The organization of speech shows that, in a foreign language classroom situation, speakers make the linguistic choices in accordance to their judgment of what is easy, simple, and clear to the listener to hear, perceive, and comprehend. In doing so, they systematically pattern their speech to match the level of limited competence of the hearer."[17]

From the data of the present study, it is possible that in spontaneous, naturally-occurring conversational interactions, the NS does not bring preconceived judgements as to what types of constructions best suit the particular audience being addressed.

It must be noted, moreover, that the present study supports Ferguson's findings that NSs have a very negative attitude toward 'foreigner talk'. The fact that only one out of twenty-six subjects used 'foreigner talk' can be taken as an indication that NSs, in this study at least, did indeed find 'foreigner talk' distasteful. Ferguson states that the "...general attitude seemed to be that foreigner talk was not a good thing--it sounds too condescending or would hinder learning good English---but could be used if necessary."[18]

B. Translation

Whenever the above strategies failed to produce comprehension, the NS resorted to the least used strategy, translation. Because of the large population of Spanish and Polish speakers in the Chicago area, most of the

cases involving the use of interpreters were with Spanish and occasionally Polish speakers. Invariably, the NSs would attempt to communicate in English first regardless of the NNS's linguistic proficiency. Even in cases where the NNS was obviously mono-lingual, the NS first attempted to communicate in grammatically correct English sentences before proceeding to translation.

II. Verification of NNS's Discourse

A large portion of the NS's speech functioned as verification. Verification of the NNS's utterances, portion of utterances or individual lexical items became necessary when the NNS's speech was phonologically unclear or when the NS wished to make certain that what he/she heard was what the NNS actually had said.

A. Syntactic Organization

Repetition of whole, or reduced sentences and paraphrasing were used by the NSs to achieve verification. Unlike what the data showed for establishing discourse, in verification, no cases of rephrasing were found: In cases where the NNS's utterances were grammatically or semantically incorrect, the NS repeated the whole sentence in a corrected form with either rising intonation or in a question format.

1. In addition to repetition of either the NNS's whole sentences or sentence fragments, repetition of individual lexical items were also utilized.

a. Repetition of the NNS's whole utterance by the NS appears to be the most widely used method of verification:

NS. Where's the letter?
NNS. He no got it.
NS. He doesn't have it?

or

NNS. I filed for my sister.
NS. You filed for your sister?
NNS. Yes.

or

NNS. I applied don't have yet.
NS. You haven't applied yet?
NNS. I want to file for my stepdaughter.
NS. Do you want to file for your stepdaughter?
NNS. Yes.

b. Repetitions of individual lexical items or fragments of utterances seem to be used with relatively the same frequency. Examples of sentence fragments follow:

NS. When are you leaving?
NNS. As quickly...any time.
Ns. Any time?

or

NNS. My sister applied for a bisa in jæ nūari.
NS. In January?
NNS. Yes.

or

NNS. I filled out application May 1978.
NS. May of 1978?
NNS. Yes.

c. In repetition of individual lexical items, the NS selects a salient lexical item from the NNSs utterance and repeats it.

NS. Where's your wife now?
NNS. In Canada.
NS. Canada?

or

NS. Your address?
NNS. (no response)
NS. Where do you live?
NNS. 28 Falsti.
NS. 28...15? (Asks NNS to write (down information)

2. The other syntactic strategy used in verification is paraphrasing, where the NS repeats a paraphrased version of the NNS's utterance in a question format:

NNS. This is an application. I must have fingerprints.
NS. All you need is to take your fingerprints? Is that it?
NNS. Yes.

or

NNS. Last week someone stole my pocket...things citizenship... passport.
NS. Last week someone stole your citizenship papers and your passport?
NNS. Yes.

NNS. I want to see if I bring my wife here.
NS. You want her to come here?
NNS. Yes.

or

NNS. I want to stay here longer.
NS. You want to extend your stay?
NNS. Yes.

Verification of the NNS's utterances by the NS is an important strategy in native-non-native conversational interactions. From the examples cited, it is evident that the problem is not one of lack of comprehension but one of uncertainty. In all cases the NSs understood the original sentences because they were able to either repeat them or paraphrase them. Why does the need for verification arise if comprehension is achieved? It appears that in real life settings, where the object of the interaction is to give and obtain precise, accurate information, no residual doubts can remain. And it may be for this reason that verification plays such an important part in the strategies of communication in native-non-native conversations.

III. Corrective Acts

A very large part of the conversational interactions fall into the category of corrective acts. A correction in this study includes both the traditional righting of incorrect linguistic material as well as any verbal signals by the NS which display uncertainty or rejection of the NNS's utterance.

In the introduction to this paper, a number of questions relating to error-correction were posed. The analysis of the corrective acts will attempt to address those questions. What, if any, corrective feed-back do NSs provide the learners? That is, does the NS signal that the learner has produced an error? What are the strategies used to correct those errors? And finally, do the NSs correct most phonological, lexical and syntactic errors? Before attempting to answer these questions, a typology of corrective acts was made. The NS's corrective acts were divided into two general categories: ego-inflating and ego-deflating. Additionally, the errors found were categorized in terms of phonology, morphology, lexicon and syntax.

A. Ego-inflating

The ego-inflating category designates those corrective acts which are polite and ambiguously structured so that, as Gaskill noted, they display uncertainty. In other words, the NS does not outright reject the NNS's utterance. The NNS "saves face" because, again using Gaskill's terms, the corrections were proferred for acceptance or rejection rather than asserted.

The uncertainty displayed by the NS is executed mainly through repetitions of the NNS's speech or through expressions such as "Pardon me" or "Can you repeat that please?" in question formats.

It must be noted that corrective acts and verification acts are not mutually exclusive. Often, the repetition of a NNS's corrected utterance can serve two functions simultaneously. It can either be a verification or a correction or both. As Gaskill correctly observed, sometimes, there is no way of determining whether a particular example involves a correction or not. It must be noted, moreover, that whether or not the NS is consciously aware that he is in fact making corrections of the NNS's utterances is not certain. If the NNS's speech is comprehensible enough so that the NS can repeat it, why does the NS feel compelled to repeat it? As mentioned earlier it could be for verification purposes or it could be that, for some psycholinguistic reason, the NS feels a need to hear the word correctly pronounced. Thus, in order to satisy this need, the NS repeats the utterance in a corrected form. What is important, however, is not whether a particular instance is a correction or a verification or whether the NS is aware that a correction is being made; what is important, is to let the language learner know that NSs employ such strategies. The significance of this as it relates to classroom application will be discussed later.

In the ego-inflating category, correction of phonological, lexical, syntactic or morphological errors is achieved mostly through repetition in a question format of that portion of the utterance which was improperly formed. Examples in the categories of phonology, lexicon and syntax abound. Thus in phonology numerous examples can be found:

NNS. I first came in Jenúari, 1975.
N. January?

or

NNS. I want to change to E (I) 90.
NS. You want to change to I (aɪ) 90?

or

NNS. Do you have my pails?
NS. No, we don't keep files in this office.

NS. What's the address?
NNS. 8 pfɪty.
NS. Eight...fifty?
NNS. Yes.

or

NS. What's your address?
NNS. e ...for..naɪŋ
NS. Eight...four...nine?
NNS. Yes.

Lexical items are usually corrected by means of repetition as well. Although the NS repeats the entire utterance, he inserts the correct lexical item which was improperly used by the NNS.

NNS. I want an invitation card.
NS. Invitation? (stress on voice)
NNS. What you call it?
NS. A petition?
NNS. Yes

or

NNS. I want to have new application because I did not make test.
NS. Oh, you failed the test? You want a new application?

or

NNS. Telephone have alarm?
NS. The telephone rings, yes. It has a bell, sir. Would you like me to show you how it works?
NNS. Yes, please.

Examples of repetition in syntax are also evident. The NS repeats the NNS's utterance syntactically correct.

NS. Where is the letter?
NNS. He no got.
NS. He doesn't have it?
NNS. No.

or

NNS. Application I make in April.
NS. In April you want to apply?
NNS. (no response)
NS. (NS writes down April on her note pad)

or

NS. Birthday?
NNS. First Jenüari.
NS. January first?
NNS. Yes.

Examples of morphological corrections were the least evidenced in the data. A few cases could be found, however.

NNS. I losted my Green card.
NS. You lost your Green card?
NNS. Yes, I need a new one.

or

NS. Can I see your passport?
NNS. I doesn't have it.
NS. You don't have it?
NNS. No.

or

NNS. Telephone have alarm?
NS. The telephone rings, yes. It has a bell, sir...

It should be mentioned that in any one particular utterance the NS may correct the NNS in one area only or in any of the four. Thus, in the sentence (NNS. "Telephone have alarm?" NS. "The telephone rings, yes. It has a bell, sir.") two corrections are being made. One is a lexical item (bell for alarm) and the other is a morphological problem (has for have).

In addition to repetitions used in ego-inflating corrective strategies, expressions such as "Pardon me" or "You mean" etc. were abundant. The expressions modulate the correction so that the correction is not asserted but is "proferred for acceptance or rejection." The most common expressions (in the order of frequency) were "Pardon me," "What..." in various formats, "You mean," "Could you repeat that" or what this investigator has termed "hearing difficulty expressions such as "I can't hear that."

NNS. I loss my Drivers License.
NS. Pardon me?
NNS. I loss my Drivers License.
NS. You lost your Drivers License? O.K.

or

NS. Why did you bring only $700.00 with you?
NNS. Hmm...(says something unintelligible)
NS. Pardon me?
NS. (continues with another line of questioning)

NNS. Now I am in this machine? (points to a T.V. monitor indicating numbers to be called next)
NS. Pardon me?
NNS. Where I go?
NS. Watch for this number on the screen.

or

NNS. You have dūnʌz?
NS. Pardon me?
NNS. You have dūnʌz? (points to the counter)
NS. Donuts? Yes, I do. How many do you want?

"What" in various formats was also employed.

NNS. My son has 14 years old.
NS. Your son what?
NSS. My son has 14 years old.
NS. Your son is 14 years old?
NNS. Yes.

or

NNS. I ūan to make extension. Can I have any paper?
NS. Any paper? Like what?
NNS. I ūan file.
NS. Oh, O.K. (hands application to NNS)

or

NNS. Sacramento next?
NS. What?
NNS. Sacramento nest?
NS. Is Sacramento next? Yes. It is.

or

NNS. I ūan a change for his bisa.
NS. A change for what?
NNS. (says something unintelligible)

or

NNS. I finish. I ūan change.
NS. What?
NNS. Tomorrow finish.
NS. Oh, you want to renew it?
NNS. Tomorrow finished. Last day... three.
NS. What?

"You mean" and "Can you repeat that?" expressions are also used to permit the NNS to exercise the option of correcting the utterance. Both of these are used much less frequently.

NNS. I looking for bisa.
NS. What do you mean?

or

NNS. The wife is going to stay here. Do I need to do another form?
NS. Could you repeat that please?
NNS. My wife is going to stay here. Do I need to do another form?
NS. Yes. Here's an application form for your wife.

In ego-inflating corrective strategies, where expressions are used, the least used expression is the "I can't hear you" variety which permits the NS to assume the responsibility for communication breakdowns. Instead of placing the burden on the NNS's language limitations, the NS in effect implies that his hearing problem is the cause of the problem. Because only three examples are found, there may be some question whether or not this constitutes a strategy.

NNS. Do you stop at Brʌjūeɪɹ?
NS. What?
NNS. Do you stop at Brʌjūeɪɹ?
NS. I can't hear you. Can you repeat that?
NNS. (Yells) Do you stop at Brʌjūeɪɹ?
NS. Do I stop where?
NNS. Brʌjūeɪɹ?
NS. Broadway? Yes, I do.

It must be mentioned that the investigator was sitting right behind the bus driver, and the utterance was clearly audible to her. Additionally, since the bus driver did not understand the NNS's utterance even after he repeated it at a very high volume, the probability that this expression was a strategy is great.

In yet another example, the NS asks the NNS to repeat the utterance because she cannot hear the NNS.

NNS. I...no...I ūan tʂeɪn my address.
NS. Would you please repeat that. I can't hear you.
NNS. I ūan tʂeɪn my address.
NS. You want to change your address?
NNS. Yes.

or

NNS. I have to report my papers.
NS. What did you say? I can't hear you.
NNS. I want the Green card.
NS. O.K.

Again, as in the first example, the investigator was sitting next to the NSs at the counter. Since the utterances were audible to her, and since the NNS repeated the utterances in basically the original format, it is quite possible that the "I can't hear you" variety expression is being used as a strategy.

The ego-inflating corrective acts involve both repetitions and expressions which tend to modulate the correction so that it is proferred for acceptance or rejection, to use Schgloff's and Gaskill's terms. Additionally it must be noted that any one utterance can evidence one or more of the strategies described above. Thus, in the following example five strategies are employed.

NNS. (says something unintelligible)
NS. Pardon me?
NNS. You have information?
NS. What?
NNS. I don know...but information.
NS. What do you mean?
NNS. A klaerɪʂʌn.
NS. A what?
NNS. A klaerɪʂʌn.
NS. A declaration. Oh, you want a declaration of intention? O.K.

Thus, in the ego-inflating strategies, the NS assumes some of the burden of communication breakdowns by not outright rejecting utterances which are incomprehensible.

B. Ego-deflating

In ego-deflating strategies, the corrections are not 'modulated' to allow for acceptance or rejection. The NS rejects the NNS's incorrect utterance outright: any communication breakdowns are attributed to the NNS's limited linguistic proficiency. Communication cannot proceed because the NS gives up too easily. Most of these corrections take the form of 'No + correction' or expressions such as "I don't understand you..." "I don't understand what you're saying..." or "Sorry, I don't understand," to outright impolite expressions.

NNS. (says something unintelligible)
NS. I don't understand, sir. Do you understand what I'm saying?
NNS. (mumbles something)

or

NS. Sorry, but I don't understand you.

or

NS. When are you leaving?
NNS. Israel.
NS. No, when are you leaving?
NNS. Any time.

NS. Can I see your Medicare card?
NNS. (provides Social Security card)
NS. No, I don't need your Social Security card. I need your Medicare card.
NNS. Yes, yes.

or

NS. Your address?
NNS. (no response)
NS. Where do you live? Write down your address. (points to a picture of a house)
NS. How heavy?
NNS. First floor.

or

NS. No, no. I want to know your weight.
NNS. Hmm.

or

NNS. Give Social Security number?
NS. What?
NNS. I don...
NS. Sir, I can't understand you. I suggest you bring a friend to translate.
NNS. (mumbles something unintelligible)
NS. Sir, I don't understand what you want. Bring a translator.
NNS. (goes away)

And, there is an example where the NS was outright rude. He did not give the NNS the opportunity to elaborate on what the NNS wished to say.

NNS. (says something unintelligible)
NS. Sir, we don't play guessing games here. You should bring someone with you.

In summary, it can be said that NSs' corrective feed-back in native-non-native conversations is a common phenomenon. By an overwhelming majority, the natives preferred strategies that are ego-inflating over those that are ego-deflating. In most instances the NSs signaled that the NNSs made mistakes mainly by displaying uncertainty of an utterance instead of outright rejection of the utterance. And this was accomplished mainly by

repetitions of one form or another or by expressions such as "Pardon me" or "What..." It must be noted, moreover, that the results of this study support Freed's data that the "...corrections tended to be of syntactic form"[19] as well as phonological form, not of substance. That is, in most instances the problem was not one of semantics but more one of structure and pronunciation. Additionally, it must be mentioned that although the NNS is constantly being given corrective feed-back, the probability is very high that he is not aware of what is going on. That is, the corrections are done in such a subtle and indirect manner that the NNS probably cannot take advantage of these as instructional tools. Gurthermore, his focus is on the immediate problem of getting meaning across and not language per se.

Another question posed at the beginning of this section on error correction was whether or not NSs correct most syntactic, phonological and lexical errors that occur. As one might assume, the answer is no. In numerous instances where errors occurred no effort was made to correct the errors. A correction did not necessarily follow an error. Flagrant syntactic errors such as (NNS. "I just finished from you") for "I just saw you," or (NNS. "We are missing short of papers.") produced no correction on the part of the NS.

The final question posed regards the relative frequency of the kinds of errors that are corrected. Because no tape recordings were permitted there was no way by which this investigator could precisely establish which kinds of errors were corrected most frequently. However, from inferential observations derived from the data, it appears that phonological errors are corrected rather often. Syntax appears to be corrected the next most frequently, with lexical errors coming in last.

A feature which was conspicuously absent in the data of the present study is what Freed calls 'conversational supports.' i.e., devices conveying the empathy that NSs feel toward NNSs' difficulty in expressing themselves. Expressions similar to those cited by Freed such as "Go on, try again." or "I know it's hard to speak English."[20] were nowhere to be found in the data.

IV. Extralinguistic Material

Non-verbal phenomena such as hand gestures, contextual guessing, speech rate, speech volume, etc. served principally to establish or verify discourse.

A. Gestures, writing and drawing

Gestures and writing, and to a less extent drawing, were utilized by the NSs.

1. Pointing and simulation of objects or actions were most commonly observed. Pointing was particularly beneficial.

NS. (holding a numbered card) When this number shows on that screen (points to screen on the wall), pay the cashier at window number three. (points)
NNS. O.K.

or

NS. Are you in line? (addressed to a man walking around)
NNS. (no response)
NS. You must be in line. See that line? (points to a line) You've got to go there.

NS. (looking at passport) Is this your first name? That long one? (points)
NNS. (no response)
NS. Name? (points to a long series of letters)
NNS. Yes.

or

NS. (addressed to applicant's companion) What's his first name?
NNS. (no response)
NS. This one? (points to a name) or that one? (points to another name)
NNS. (points to the first name on the paper)

2. Sometimes when the NS was unable to make the utterance intelligible to the NNS or when reinforcement of the verbal expression became necessary, gestures which simulated either actions or objects were utilized.

NS. (addressed to applicant's companion) We have to take his fingerprints. (simulates action of fingerprinting with thumb and index finger)
NNS. Yes, I know.

or

NS. Do you want your check on the third? (raises three fingers)
NNS. Yes.

or

NS. How tall?
NNS. 177
NS. No, how tall?
NNS. (no response)
NS. How high? (raises arm to simulate height)
NNS. (provides height in the metric system)

or

NS. Are you going to drive now?
NNS. (looks perplexed; no response)
NS. Are you going to drive? (simulates the action of driving)
NNS. (still no response)
NS. You're just going to take the written test? (simulates action of writing)
NNS. No response)
NS. (guesses that applicant needs to take the written test only)
NS. Telephone number.
NNS. (no response)
NS. Telephone? (brings fist to ear to simulate telephone)
NNS. (provides telephone number)

or

NS. Do you have a license?
NNS. (no response)
NS. Do you have a car?
NNS. (still no response)
NS. Do you have a key?
NNS. (still no response)
NS. Key? (presses index finger and thumb together to simulate the action of turning on the ignition of a car)
NNS. (shakes his head in a negative fashion)

It is clear that gestures often can facilitate and expedite communication in ways that strict verbalizations cannot. At the Department of Motor Vehicles, gestures were particularly useful because of the kinds of limited and non-abstract information being extracted from the NNSs.

3. The use of documents, writing and drawing to promote intelligibility, although less common than gestures, was also observed.

Social Security cards, passports, old Drivers Licenses, old utility bills, telephone receipts, insurance cards, etc. were employed for extracting necessary information which the NNS could not produce due to linguistic limitations. The examples that follow were particularly typical at the Department of Motor Vehicles and at the Social Security Office.

NS. May I help you?
NNS. (no response)
NS. What can I do for you?
NNS. (hands the clerk some documents)
NS. You were born on June first 1951?
NNS. (does not confirm NS's question)
NS. Your name is? (uses Social Security card to obtain the information)
NS. Your address?
NNS. (no response)
NS. (looks at a telephone receipt with man's current address)

or

NS. (looking at NNS's passport) Where's your birthdate?
NNS. Hmm...I...
NS. Where does it show your birthdate? (writes down what appears to be the NNS's birthdate)

or

NS. Do you know what letter there is on your card? Is it an A?
NNS. (looks perplexed; no response)
NS. (picks up a document and indicates where the A should be) You see this A here? Does your card have an A like this one?
NNS. (visibly happy) Yes, yes.

or

NNS. (drops some documents on the counter; says nothing.)
NS. Who are these for? (reads document)
NNS. (no response)
NS. There are two names. Who is it that you need the Social Security card for?
NNS. (points to one of the names)

or

4. Utilization of writing and drawing are strategies that the NSs sometimes found helpful to both verify the NNS's speech and to establish discourse. The sampling, though, was very limited compared to other strategies.

NS. Your address?
NNS. (no response)
NS. Where do you live?
NNS. 28 Falšti.
NS. 28...15? (Asks NNS to write down information)

or

NS. How heavy?
NNS. (no response)
NS. 160? 165?
NNS. (no response)
NS. (writes down 160 and 165 on a piece of paper)
NNS. (shakes head negatively) Writes down 180

or

NS. What's your home address?
NNS. (no response)
NS. Where do you live?
NNS. (no response)
NS. Write down your address on this paper. House. (points to the paper)

5. Although the investigator observed only one case in which the NS drew a picture of an object to convey the message, a number of the NSs commented that sometimes it is necessary for them to draw pictures of cars, books, houses, etc. to make the verbalization intelligible to the NNS. This was particularly true at the Department of Motor Vehicles where, again, such a strategy would be possible given the somewhat concrete and limited content of most conversations.

NS. What's your address?
NNS. (no response)
NS. Where do you live?
NNS. (still no response)
NS. (draws a picture of a house and indicates where the house number should be)
NNS. (provides address)

B. Contextual Guessing

Guessing from the context was common. Occasionally the NS guessed at the meaning of a NNS's unintelligible utterance without any clue other than the context.

NNS. (says something unintelligible)
NS. Pardon me?
NNS. (mumbles something again)
NS. Oh, you want an alien registration card?
NNS. (shakes her head positively)

or

NNS. (says something unintelligible)
NNS. Two or three week?
NS. What did you say?
NNS. (repeats something)
NS. Pardon me? (looks at the NNS's document and provides him with another form)
NNS. Thank you.

or

at times no verbal interaction took place:

(two men drop Polish passports on the counter)
NS. Polish test?
NNS. (no response)
NS. (opens up the passpost to obtain other information)

or

NS. Why did you bring only $700 with you?
NNS. (no response)
NS. What's C.T.S.? (looking at a card) Is this the name of your business? (guesses that C.T.S. is the name of the NNS's business)
NNS. (no response)

or

NS. (addressed to one of two men who appears to be more fluent in English) How tall is he?
NNS. (no response)
NS. Is he 5'8"? 5'6"? or 5'11"? No, he can't be 5'11".
NNS. (no response)
NS. I'd say he's probably 5'9" (guesses)

Frequently, as the NNS searched for a particular lexical item, the NS anticipated the item in question strictly from the context or from what little information the NNS could supply.

NNS. I need tu tip finger.
NS. Yes, you need two charts for fingerprints. (looking at the application)

or

NNS. I have this affidavit. (doesn't explain what he needs)
NS. Do you mean that you want to apply for a resident visa?
NNS. Yes.

or

NNS. In Germany, in Second World War, I was a soldier.
NS. Yes.
NNS. I was prisoner of U.S. I need uh...uh... papers. I don't know...
NS. You need your discharge papers, yes. Here's an application. Fill it out completely and mail it to us.

As might be expected, occasionally, the NSs' inability to achieve comprehension was so anxiety producing that they simply gave up.

NS. Do you have headaches?
NNS. (no response)
NS. Does your head hurt?
NNS. (no response)
NS. Oh, well. (looks at NNS...determines that she's healthy.
NS. Do you get dizzy spells?
NNS. (no response)
NS. You feel like you're going to fall down?
NNS. (no response)
NS. Oh, well. (again determines that NNS is healthy)

or

NNS. (says something unintelligible)
NS. Hmm? Hmm? What?
NNS. (repeats utterance)
NS. I don't understand you. Do you speak Spanish?
NNS. (no response)
NS. See if you can find somebody who speaks Spanish. I can't help you.

It must be noted that at one of the restaurant kitchens, where the investigator was permitted to observe communication between native-speaking and non-native-speaking employees, the NSs volunteered that good-natured joking, particularly 'dirty jokes,' is important in breaking down language barriers and in promoting employee morale.

C. Speech Rate

Without instruments to measure the exact rate of speech used by the NSs in native-native and native-non-native conversations, it is difficult to objectively gauge such phenomena. As expected, slower speech rate did occur, but not significantly often. Of the 26 NSs only two seemed to use the strategy of articulating distinctly, slowly and clearly as their main strategy of communication. That is, the speech of these two subjects was delivered one word at a time with frequent pauses. Casually comparing similar speech addressed to NSs, it appears that the majority of the NSs did not adjust the rate of speech to such an extent that it was noticeable to this investigator.

D. Speech Volume

Again, without instruments available to measure the volume of speech, the observations made are strictly inferential. It seems that NSs have a tendency to speak at a much higher volume with NNSs than with each other. In general it is difficult to accurately determine speech volume because of the locations where speech was observed. This was particularly true at the Social Security Office and in the public transportation system. NSs may seem to have talked at a much higher volume at some sites because of outside noise or because the NNSs were elderly rather than as a strategy of dealing with them just because they were NNSs.

E. Socio-linguistic Phenomena

Before proceeding to a discussion of the implications of the results, it is necessary to consider some socio-linguistic factors which though not categorized as strategies, may be important in understanding why NSs apply particular strategies when communicating with NNSs.

Certain cultural biases which possibly stem from unconscious value judgments were evident in the comments of the NSs. Their statements substantiate Halls' observations that "...people from different cultures not only speak different languages but, what is possibly more important, inhabit different sensory worlds."[21]

Social spacing, that is, the distance considered appropriate under various social circumstances to be used between interlocutors, differs from one culture to another. A NS volunteered that she felt physical discomfort whenever a NNSing co-worker spoke to her because as she put it "He stands too close." In other words, this NNS violated her social space by inappropriately using what Hall calls the "intimate distance" in public, i.e., "...the distance of love-making and wrestling, comforting and protecting."[22]

Another type of culturally based observations made by the NSs involves the perceived behavior of particular ethnics groups. Numerous NSs, for example, commented that Indians and Pakistanis are impertinent, argumentative and do not yield to persuasion easily. Others mentioned that Koreans and Japanese are very polite, and yet others noticed that Hispanics, though polite, are timid. It is quite possible that NSs' attitudes which are based on perceived behavior leads to particular behavior on the part of the NSs whenever handling different ethnic groups. The behavior may become a vicious circle which could well lead to the "self-fulfilling prophesy" effect.

It must be mentioned that at one particular location, some of the NSs'

attitude toward the NNS's inability to speak English was less than positive. They alluded to the fact that the NNSs did not know personal information which NSs take for granted such as height, weight, zip codes, etc. Their annoyance was evident by comments such as "You mean you don't know your height?" or speaking to another co-worker, "The guy doesn't even know how much he weighs."

Additionally, three of the NSs made sarcastic remarks about the NNS's need to be accompanied by interpreters. Statements such as "Here they come with their lawyers" or "Do you know that they bring lawyers?" were made to this investigator. Fortunately, similar negative remarks were limited; but how wide-spread such attitudes are held by those NSs dealing with foreigners is not determinable within the scope of this study. All remarks were volunteered, and no effort was made to elicit attitudinal observations on the part of the NSs.

It may well be that socio-linguistic factors such as those just described contribute to the choice of strategies that NSs are willing to make when conversing with NNSs of limited linguistic proficiency.

CONCLUSION

The need to study adult native-non-native communicative interactions that take place outside the classroom in every day, give-and-take "survival" types of situations has long been recognized by researchers in the field. Research in this area, however, is at the embryonic stage, and as a result, the scope of the present study was a general one. This investigation is similar to a few others--cited on page one--in that the object was to observe native-non-native speech, but it differed both in method and approach.

As anticipated, the NSs had at their disposal a wide range of strategies to be utilized whenever communication breakdowns occurred. The strategies fall into three broad categories: syntactic, non-verbal and translation. Although each category was not present in every instance, strategies functioned to establish discourse, verify discourse and to correct ungrammatical or mispronounced speech. The syntactic strategy recurring most often is various kinds of repetitions. The next most frequently used strategy being paraphrasing: Both serve to establish discourse, verify discourse and to make corrections. Although there was a high proportion of rephrasing as well, this particular strategy was limited to establishing discourse only. It was not found in either verification of discourse or in corrective acts. Corrective acts were described as either ego-inflating or ego-deflating for the NNS. By an overwhelming majority the NSs chose the former. The results further reveal that 'foreigner talk' as defined in this paper, was almost non-existent. Additionally, it was noted that translation is a strategy of last resort, usually employed only when other attempts at communication have failed. It was also observed that a number of non-verbal strategies such as hand gestures, the use of writing and drawing, etc., are beneficial for reinforcing verbalizations when establishing or verifying discourse.

When this study was undertaken, it was hoped that the results might provide some insights into current classroom practices such as error correction, the use of 'foreigner talk' and translation in the classroom by the E.S.L. teacher as well as pedagogical methodology presently in vogue.

Based on the results of the present study, the following observations seem to be justifiable.

Error correction in naturally-occurring speech seems to be a common phenomena, but the process appears to be different from the way it happens in the classroom. As Krashen noted, in the classroom the teacher usually lets the student know that an error has been committed; however, in natural situations, the NNS usually is not aware that an error occurred or that it was corrected. The implication for teachers is clear. They must alert the students to the corrective strategies that NSs can use when speaking to NNSs. Naturally, this ties in nicely to a listening comprehension component of teaching. If the student is aware that NSs frequently repeat the NNS's utterance because such utterances are incorrectly formed, then the NNS has the opportunity to receive corrective feed-back which may help in quicker acquisition of particular linguistic items. Students must learn what the feedback is, and they must observe which strategies they themselves find NSs use. The student ought to learn to understand not only what is said, but how it is said. This brings us to another area which has been hotly debated in professional journals: content versus form in language instruction. From the data it appears that, contrary to Terrels's statement at the beginning of this paper, corrective feed-back goes on all the time in naturally-occurring speech. The mechanism may be different, but properly formed speech by the NNSs must be extremely important to the NSs, otherwise, how can it be explained that NSs frequently corrected even though the utterances were intelligible? It seems that how something is said by the NNS is equally important to the NSs. Therefore, should the teacher concentrate on teaching students to express themselves without regard to how it is said, or should they put more stress on how it is said? Perhaps they should emphasize both content and form.

That 'foreigner talk' was practically non-existent in the data seems to confirm Ferguson's observations that NSs did not find it appropriate to use this type of speech with language learners; the implication appears to be that teachers should avoid using strategies that the students will not encounter in naturally-occurring "survival types" of situations. In using 'foreigner talk' the teacher possibly may be misleading the students into thinking that if they understand the teacher they will also be able to comprehend speech outside the classroom. If indeed, this is the case, the students could quite possibly become frustrated with their learning situation which, undoubtedly, could inhibit language acquisition. This also seems to re-affirm what many teachers have suspected all along, that the use of slow speech by the teacher in the E.S.L. classroom is detrimental to the students.

Another interesting aspect of the data relates to the current discussion of the merits of various types of instructional syllabuses available to teachers. The results may provide the initial rationale for Notional Syllabuses, which stress semantic content over grammar. It was discovered that in naturally-occurring speech NSs can use the full range of grammatical structures in English to express one idea. That is, the NS does not restrict his speech to particular verb tenses or particular lexical items. He may use any number of structures or different vocabulary to convey the same meaning. In many instances it was noted that regardless of the linguistic ability of the NNS, the NS used varied linguistic structures and multiple lexical items to express the original meaning of the utterance. Naturally, this leads to the question of vocabulary acquisition. What should the priority of vocabulary be in relation to other subject matter such as grammar and phonology? Interpreting the data with caution, it seems that more stress should be placed on vocabulary than is presently done because in any conversational situation outside the classroom, the student will encounter varied lexical

items to express the same meaning. In many cases it was clear that the NNSs identified sentential meaning from specific lexical signals provided by the NSs. (See e.g., p. 9)

With regard to translation as a strategy in the classroom, since the NSs appeared to avoid translation at all costs, it seems that again, the use of translation either by the teacher or peers is an inappropriate crutch which the students will not commonly encounter in ordinary situations outside the classroom.

Additionally, since the use of non-verbal strategies such as documents, writing etc., was so effective in producing intelligibility, perhaps teachers should set up situations in which realistic "survival" kinds of communication can be elicited by utilizing the students' personal documents, passports, etc.

The results of this investigation indicate that NSs avail themselves of various strategies to communicate with NNSs in naturally-occurring speech. The strategies are not always mutually exclusive; the NS may utilize one or any other number of strategies within each conversational interaction. Some of the strategies are similar to strategies used by NS in controlled, artificial environments, and yet others seem to be particular to speech addressed to NNSs in naturally-occurring settings. Furthermore, it appears that conclusions can be reached which may reflect negatively on some current classroom practices by E.S.L. teachers.

Acknowledging the limitations of the method of this study, it would seem appropriate that in future research, the investigator try to record on tape the conversations and use instruments which could permit accurate reproduction of such phenomena as speech rate and speech volume. Ideally, but maybe impossible, video-taping the conversations would be a far superior effort.

The fact that this study was an all-encompassing one necessarily restricted the depth of the results. Therefore, for those interested in pursuing similar research, a few suggestions might be appropriate. The investigator should take one topic at a time such as corrective acts or non-verbal strategies and study it in detail at different locations. It would also be interesting to do a statistically-based project to determine which of the strategies already described are the most effective. Additionally, future research might concentrate on particular variables such as the NSs' attitudes toward their English-speaking versus their non-English-speaking clients to determine if attitudes affect the kinds of strategies that are chosen by the NSs, particularly the use of 'foreigner talk.' Since the only subject to use 'foreigner talk' in this study expressed feelings of empathy toward NNSs' inability to speak English, there might possibly be a correlation between attitudes and strategies utilized by the NSs. And finally, it might be useful to know why the NSs correct speech which seemingly is already intelligible.

As a concluding remark to those interested in the area of conversational analysis in naturally-occurring, "survival type" environments, the possibility for research is considerable because little has been done. However, the research is time-consuming and many logistic problems arise in that it is very difficult to get access to the speech interactions without letting the NSs know that their speech is being recorded, particularly if it is video-taped.

APPENDIX

SCHEMA OF STRATEGIES
Used by Native Speakers

ut. = utterance
NS - Native Speaker
NNS - Non-Native Speaker

Type of Strategy	Description	Example	Page
I. ESTABLISHING DISCOURSE			
A. Syntactic Organization			
1. Repetition	Various kinds of repetitions:		
a.	Exact word-by-word repetition.	NS. Where's your husband? NNS. (no response) NS. Where's your husband?	
b.	Repetition of either own ut. or NNS's but adds some sort of lexical contrast.	NS. How did she come? NNS. What? NS. How did she come? As a resident or a visitor?	
c.	Repetition of NNS's ut. in either a WH or Yes/no question format. An incorrectly used lexical item may be replaced with a correct form.	NNS. I want Ūron. NS. You want what? NNS. Ūron. NS. Huron. Oh, you want Huron. NNS. Yes.	
d.	Repetition with reduction in sytax.	NS. Give me cod fish. NNS. What? NS. Cod fish...three. NNS. (no response) NS. Do you understand? Three fish.	
e.	Repetition with expansion. NS adds linguistic material to make ut. more complete.	NS. Do you want to know how much you get back? NNS. (no response) NS. Next May. Next May you get the full amount. NNS. (still no response) NS. Next year, 1979, you get the full amount.	
2. Paraphrasing	NS paraphrases original ut. by rearranging the syntactic format.	NS. Your husband isn't getting checks from us. NNS. (looks perplexed) NS. He doesn't get checks from us. NNS. (looks perplexed)	

Type of Strategy	Description	Example	Page
		NS. He does not get checks from us. NNS. (still no response) NS. I can tell you he doesn't get them. NNS. (says something unintelligible) NS. He's not getting them. NNS. Yes, I understand.	
3. Rephrasing	NS builds up a common pool of contextually and semantically related information to establish topic of conversation.	NS. What's the purpose of your trip? NNS. (no response) NS. Are you visiting? NNS. (no response) NS. You're just a tourist? NNS. (no response) NS. How long will the visit be? NNS. (still no response) NS. What's the purpose of your trip? NNS. (no response) NS. (guesses that the NNS is a tourist)	
4. Foreigner Talk	NS uses what has been described as Foreigner Talk.	NS. Is this your first time? NNS. (no response) NS. Never...before? Drive? Here? NNS. (still no response) NS. But in Poland you drive? ...But not here? NNS. (no response)	
B.	If available, NS uses interpreters. Most of the time this involved Spanish or Polish speakers.	NNS. I no speak English NS. What do you speak? NNS. (no response) NS. Do you speak Spanish? NNS. Yes. (NS gets interpreter)	
II. VERIFICATION OF DISCOURSE			
A. Syntactic Organization			
1. Repetition	Various kinds of repetitions:		
a.	Repetition of the NNS's whole ut.	NNS. I filed for my sister. NS. You filed for your sister? NNS. Yes.	
b.	Repetition of sentence fragments.	NS. When are you leaving? NNS. As quickly...any time. NS. Any time?	

Type of Strategy	Description	Example	Page
c.	Repetition of individual lexical items.	NS. Where's your wife now? NNS. In Canada. NS. Canada?	
2. Paraphrasing	NS verifies meaning of NNS's ut. by paraphrasing it in a question format.	NNS. I want to stay here longer. NS. You want to extend your stay? NNS. Yes.	
III. CORRECTIVE ACTS			
A. Ego-inflating	Modulated, polite corrections. NNS "saves face" because he is not told that his ut. is incomprehensible. NS does not outright reject NNS's ut.	NNS. (says something unintelligible) NS. Pardon me? NNS. You have information? NS. What? NNS. I don know...but infortion. NS. What do you mean? NNS. A klaerɪʃʌn. NS. A what? NNS. A klaerɪʃʌn. NS. A declaration. Oh, you want a declaration of intention? O.K.	
B. Ego-deflating	Unmodulated corrections; NNS does not "save face" because NS rejects ut. outright.	NS. When are you leaving? NNS. Israel. NS. No, when are you leaving? NNS. Any time.	
IV. EXTRALINGUISTIC	Non-verbal phenomena.		
A. Gestures, writing and drawing			
1. Pointing	Deictic, non-verbal signals.	NS. (holding a numbered card) When this number shows on that screen (points to screen on the wall), pay the cashier at window number three. (points) NNS. O.K.	
2. Simulation	Simulation of either objects or actions.	NS. (addressed to applicant's companion) We have to take his fingerprints. (simulates action of fingerprinting with thumb and index finger) NNS. Yes, I know.	

Type of Strategy	Description	Example	Page
2. Simulation	Simulation of either objects or actions.	NS. (addressed to applicant's companion) We have to take his fingerprints. (simulates action of fingerprinting with thumb and index finger) NNS. Yes, I know.	
3. Documents	Use of documents such as passports, Social Security cards, etc. to obtain information.	NS. (looking at NNS's passport) Where's your birthdate? NNS. Hmm...I... NS. Where does it show your birthdate? (writes down what appears to be the NNS's birthdate)	
4. Writing		NS. Your address? NNS. (no response) NS. Where do you live? NNS. 28 Faršti. NS. 28...15? (Asks NNS to write down information)	
5. Drawing		NS. What's your address? NNS. (no response) NS. Where do you live? NNS. (still no response) NS. (draws a picture of a house and indicates where the house number should be) NNS. (provides address)	
B. Contextual Guessing	NS guesses at meaning of NNS's ut. without clue other than context.	NNS. (says something unintelligible) NS. Pardon me? NNS. (mumbles something again) NS. Oh, you want an alien registration card? NNS. (shakes her head positively)	
C. Speech Rate	Without instruments to measure the exact rate of speech, it appears that slower speech rate did occur, but not significantly often.		

Type of Strategy	Description	Example	Page
D. Speech Volume	Again, without instruments to measure the volume of speech, it seems that NSs have a tendency to speak at a much higher volume than is found in normal, native-native conversations.		
E. Socio-linguistic Phenomena	Though not categorized as strategies per se, socio-linguistic factors such as social spacing may be important in understanding why NSs apply particular strategies when communicating with NNSs.		

* * * * *

FOOTNOTES

[1]John Fanselow, The treatment of error in oral work. Foreign Language Annals, 1977, 10, 5: 593.

[2]C. A. Ferguson, Absence of copula and the notion of simplicity. In D. Hymes (ED.). Pidginization and creolization of language. Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press. 1971, p. 143.

[3]Vera M. Henzl, Linguistic register of foreign language instruction. Language Learning, 1973, 23: 213.

[4]Ibid., p. 210.

[5]Barbara F. Freed, Foreigner talk: A study of speech adjustments made by native speakers of English in conversation with non-native speakers. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1978, p. 237.

[6]Ibid., p. 238

[7]Ibid., p. 235.

[8]S. Krashen and H. Seliger, The essential contributions of formal instruction in adult second language learning. TESOL Quarterly, 1975, 9, 2: 180.

[9]Ibid., p. 181

[10]Tracy D. Terrell, A natural approach to second language acquisition and learning. The Modern Language Journal, 1977, 61, 7: 330.

[11]C. Chaudron, A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors. Language Learning, 1977. 27, 1: 31.

[12]W. Gaskill, Correction in adult native speaker--non-native speaker conversation. M.A. thesis, U.C.L.A., 1977, p. vi.

[13]Barbara F. Freed, Talking to foreigners versus talking to children: Similarities and differences. (Personal correspondence, May, 1979) p. 8.

[14]Evelyn M. Hatch, Discourse analysis and second language acquisition. In E.M. Hatch (ED.). Second Language Acquisition: A Book of Readings. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, Inc. 1978, p. 416.

[15]Ibid., p. 416.

[16]Henzl, Linguistic Register Instruction, p. 213.

[17]Ibid., p. 218.

[18]Ferguson, Absence of Copula Simplicity, p. 11.

[19]Barbara F. Freed, Talking to foreigners versus talking to children: Similarities and differences. (Personal correspondence, May, 1979) p. 13.

[20]Ibid., p. 13.

[21]Edward T. Hall, The Hidden Dimension. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1966, p. 2.

[22]Ibid., p. 110.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Chaudron, C. A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors. Language Learning, 1977, 27, 1: 29-46.
The author discusses the various corrective acts employed in the classroom, and he speculates that the reaction of the native speaker to the errors of the second language learner may affect the rate of learning. He also calls for future research which can provide a description of the corrective feedback that might likely be the most motivating and effecting.

Cohen, Andrew D. Error correction and the training of language teachers. The Modern Language Jornal, 1975, 59, 8: 414-422.
Cohen provides justifications for the use of error analysis techniques in language teachers' training programs. However, he also questions the trend toward 'communicative competence', i.e., spontaneity, at the expense of correctly formed speech.

Cohen, Andrew and Robbins, M. Toward assessing interlanguage performance: The relationship between selected errors, learners' characteristics, and learners' explanations. Language Learning, 1976, 26, 45-66.
An error analysis of written verb forms was undertaken to determine the short-term effects of teacher correction procedures on the eradication of errors and second, to relate interlanguage background and learners' explanation of errors.

Fanselow, John The treatment of error in oral work. Foreign Language Annals, 1977, 10, 583-593.

Fanselow discusses the treatment of errors in oral work in the classroom. He notes that language learners, who immerse themselves in the target language and culture, are not asked to identify objects, learn items one at a time, nor are they asked to repeat mispronounced items. Moreover, he points out that studies which study everyday give-and-take situations between those learning a language and the native speakers might provide insights into the proper role of corrective feedback in oral work in the classroom.

Ferguson, C.A. Absence of copula and the notion of simplicity. In D. Hymes (ED.). Pidginization and creolization of language. Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press. 1971.
This article examines the presence or absence of copula in some languages or special varieties or registers of a language.

Ferguson, C.A. Toward a characterization of English foreigner talk. Anthropological Linguistics, 1975, 17, 1-14.
In this study, Ferguson asks his students to rewrite standard English sentences into what they would consider to be 'foreigner talk.' From the results, Ferguson makes a typology of the features of 'foreigner talk.'

Freed, Barbara F. Foreigner talk: A study of speech adjustments made by native speakers of English in conversation with non-native speakers. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1978.
Freed analyzes the characteristics of native-native and native-non-native speech in order to make a typology of the features of 'foreigner talk.'

Freed, Barbara F. Talking to foreigners versus talking to children: Similarities and differences. (Personal correspondence, May, 1979.)
Compares the 'foreigner talk' register with the 'baby talk' register.

Gaies, S.J. The syntax of ESL teachers' classroom language: A preliminary report. ERIC, 1976, ED 134 042, 1-9.
The present paper reported that teachers' classroom speech is syntactically different from their speech among linguistic peers.

Gaskill, W. Correction in adult native speaker--non-native speaker conversation. M.A. thesis, U.C.L.A., 1977.
Analysis of other-corrections in native-non-native speech suggests that other-corrections generally parallel those described by Schgloff, Jefferson and Sacks in native-native conversation.

Hall, Edward T. The Hidden Dimension. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1966.
The main objective of this book is to study the concepts of social and personal space and to observe how people from different cultures perceive such phenomena.

Hatch, Evelyn M. Discourse analysis and second language acquisition. In E.M. Hatch (ED.) Second Language Acquisition: A Book of Readings. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, Inc., 1978.
This paper provides a rationale for discourse analysis as a methodology for the study of second language acquisition.

Henzl, Vera M. Linguistic register of foreign language instruction. Language Learning, 1973, 23, 207-222.

It was discovered that foreign language classroom register used by the teacher is a linguistic subsystem that can be defined by rules of linguistic simplification similar to those of 'foreigner talk' and 'baby talk' registers.

Holley, F. and King, J. Imitation and correction in foreign language learning. The Modern Language Journal, 1971, 55, 8, 494-498.
This article explores the degree to which accepted methods of correction may contribute to poor student performance. Perhaps overt correction may be unnecessary or even inadvisable.

Krashen, S. Formal and informal linguistic environments in language acquisition and language learning. TESOL Quarterly, 1976, 10, 2: 157-168.
Krashen posits the thesis that both formal and informal methods of learning contribute to second langauge learning but in different ways.

Krashen, S. and Seliger, H. The essential contributions of formal instruction in adult second language learning. TESOL Quarterly, 1975, 9, 2: 173-183.
The authors provide a description of the characteristics of formal instruction and they also include a definition of the deductive and inductive methods of learning. Additionally, they note the possibility that learners who seem to "pick up" languages well outside the classroom probably have some way of approaching items one at a time via bi-lingual dictionaries, grammars or sympathetic native speakers.

Newmark, Leonard How not to interfere with language learning. In Edward W. Najam (ED.). Language Learning: The Individual and the Process. Bloomington: Indiana University. 1965.
Newmark maintains that language is learned a whole act at a time rather than learned as an assemblage of various language skills.

Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G. and Sacks, H. The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. Language, 1977, 53, 361-382.
Analysis of native-native conversational interactions reveals that 'self-repair' predominates over 'other-repair.' Moreover, other-corrections display uncertainty and are modulated so that corrections, which are done in question formats or by expressions such as "y' mean," are more of a proposal than an assertion.

Terrell, Tracy D. A natural approach to second language acquisition and learning. The Modern Language Journal, 1977, 61, 7, 325-337.
The author suggests a more natural approach to the teaching of a second language in an academic situation. She proposes three guidelines to achieve this natural setting: Students may use their native language along with the target language at the initial stages; students' speech errors should not be corrected and class time should be devoted totally to communication experiences.

Valdman, Albert Error analysis and grading in the preparation of teaching materials. The Modern Language Journal, 1975, 59, 8: 422-426.
Valdman asserts that pedagogical sequencing must rely primarily on grammatical analysis, and that at the moment, it is premature to arrange teaching materials on the basis of notional analyses.